



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

110

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,819	10/01/2003	Werner Nagler	449122062900	8777

7590 03/20/2007
Kevin R. Spivak
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Suite 300
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

VIANA DI PRISCO, GERMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2609	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,819	Applicant(s) NAGLER, WERNER	
	Examiner German Viana Di Prisco	Art Unit 2609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01 October 2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement submitted on October 1, 2003 has been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

Drawings

3. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaich et al. (United States Patent No.: 4,763,316).

Consider claim 1 Schaich et al. show and disclose a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system, comprising: at least two line and trunk groups that form a redundancy pair, LTG1, LTG2 (figure 2) and have at least one cross-connection, with each line and trunk group having at least one central controller, GP1, GP2 (figure 2); at least one interface to the exchange-internal switching network, GS1 (figure 2); a line circuit area for the PCM circuits, DIU1(figure 2); at least one transformer/framer for synchronization for each PCM circuit (in column 7 lines 1-13 Schaich et al. teach that the switching that takes place in the time division multiplex switching device GS1 is carried out in a known manner; it is inherent in the art that an elastic buffer/framer is used to compensate timing differences in plesiochronous PCM circuits), wherein the circuit arrangement is configured such that a fault occurring in the switching arrangement affects a maximum of two PCM circuits (as shown in figure 2, a fault will affect one PCM circuit); and switching elements, that directly and asynchronously select the PCM circuits individually and one of the two central controllers optionally, are positioned before the transformers/framers (changeover switches in figure 2).

Consider claim 2 and as applied to claim 1 above, Schaich et al. clearly show and disclose changeover switches 1d1 through 2d4 used to switch PCM circuits and

Art Unit: 2609

that change from a normal operating position to an emergency position. It is well understood in the art that solid-state relays are used for this purpose (figure 2 and column 6 lines 12-21).

Consider claim 3, and as applied to claim 1 above, Schaich et al. clearly show and disclose a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system wherein control of the upstream switching elements is achieved by the central controllers GP1 and GP2 of the line terminal group, (figure 2).

Consider claim 5, and as applied to claim 1 above, Schaich et al. clearly show and disclose a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system wherein each line and trunk group, that together forms a redundancy pair, has as many transformers/framers as the total PCM circuits connected to the redundancy pair (either group switch GS1, GS2 as shown in figure 2 is able to connect all PCM circuits 1u1 to 2u4 connected to the redundancy pair LTG1,LTG2. In column 7 lines 1-13 Schaich et al. further teach that the switching that takes place in the time division multiplex switching devices GS1, GS2 is carried out in a known manner; it is inherent in the art that an elastic buffer/framer is used to compensate timing differences in plesiochronous PCM circuits.)

Consider claim 7, and as applied to claim 1 above, Schaich et al. clearly show a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system wherein one microprocessor, that controls the functions of surrounding components, is arranged at each line and trunk group (group processors GP1, GP2 in figure 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaich et al. (United States Patent No.: 4,763,316) in view of applicant's own admission of prior art (as disclosed on paragraph [0022] in regards to figure 1 of the instant application).

Consider claim 4, and as applied to claim 1 above, Schaich et al. clearly show and disclose a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system wherein each line and trunk group, that together forms a redundancy pair.

However Schaich et al. do not disclose that the transformer/framer for synchronization of the PCM circuits is integrated into the central controller.

In the same field of endeavor applicant's admission of prior art clearly shows and discloses a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system wherein the transformer/framer 7.4,7.4' for synchronization of the PCM circuits is integrated into the central controller 10,10'(figure 1 and page 10 lines 9-15).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to integrate the transformer/framer for synchronization of the PCM circuits for synchronization of the PCM circuits into the central controller as disclosed by applicant's admission of prior art in the arrangement of Schaich et al. in order to reduce the number of components and reduce circuit size as well as to lower manufacturing costs.

8. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaich et al. (United States Patent No.: 4,763,316) in view of Nagler et al. (United States Patent No.: 5,043,978).

Consider claim 6 and as applied to claim 1 above, Schaich et al. clearly show and disclose a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system.

However Schaich et al. do not disclose that power supply of the line and trunk group and its surrounding components are integrated into the central controller.

In the same field of endeavor, Nagler et al. clearly show a circuit arrangement for connecting trunk lines via PCM circuits to an exchange-internal switching network, for use in a switching-oriented system wherein each line and trunk group, that together forms a redundancy pair wherein a power supply of the line and trunk group and its surrounding components are integrated into the central controller (power supply unit GV1, clock pulse supply unit, GT1 in figure 1a).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to integrate the power supply of the line and trunk group and its surrounding components into the central controller as disclosed by Nagler et al. in the arrangement of Schaich et al. in order to reduce the number of components and reduce circuit size as well as to lower manufacturing costs.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Seeger et al. (United States Patent No.: 4,905,222) disclose line trunk groups coupled to a double switching matrix. Nagler (United States Patent No.: 5,440,539) discloses a method of controlling an electrical switching device in response

to a signal configuration of a switching signal. Junge et al. (United States Patent No.: 4,905,220) disclose a circuit for a central control time division multiplex PCM telecommunications system.

9. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to German Viana Di Prisco whose telephone number is (571) 270-1781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rafael Perez-Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2609

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

German Viana Di Prisco
G.V.D.P./gvdp

March 14, 2007


RAFAEL PEREZ-GUTIERREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

3/18/07